



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_19129
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of empirical models for estimation the monthly global solar radiation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Title better reads "Comparison of empirical models for the estimation of monthly solar radiation at Nigde in Turkey" ABSTRACT Methodology: remove "According to our results, all the models fitted the data adequately and can be used to estimate the specific monthly solar radiation" Conclusion: replace with 'According to our results, all the models fitted the data adequately and can be used to estimate the specific monthly solar radiation' 1. INTRODUCTION In places where no measured values are ~~not~~ available..... 4. CONCLUSION Given the small differences between the variance explained by exponent regression and the most accurate equation?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is a well organized and explained study and result findings.	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antipas T. S. Massawe
Department, University & Country	Department of Chemical & Mining Engineering, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania